

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Kwantez R. Everson,

Case No. 1:23cv701

Plaintiff,

v.

Judge Michael R. Barrett

State of Ohio, Department of
Jobs and Family Services,

Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation filed by the Magistrate Judge on December 5, 2023 (Doc. 9).

Proper notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice that the parties would waive further appeal if they failed to file objections to the Report and Recommendation in a timely manner. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court notes, however, that though such notice was served upon Plaintiff, it was returned to the Court due to Plaintiff's failure to apprise the Court of his change of address. In this Court's notice to Plaintiff on applicable court procedures, which Plaintiff received, Plaintiff was ordered to inform the Court promptly of any change of address. By failing to keep the Court apprised of his current address, Plaintiff demonstrates a lack of prosecution of his action. See, e.g., *Theede v. United States Department of Labor*, 172 F.3d 1262, 1265 (10th Cir. 1999). Failure to object to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation due to delay resulting from party's failure to bring to the Court's attention a change in address constitutes failure to object in a timely manner. Because the Recommendation

was mailed to the last known address, it was properly served, and party waived right to appellate review. See also, *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109 (6th Cir. 1991)(A *pro se* litigant has an affirmative duty to diligently pursue the prosecution of his cause of action); *Barber v. Runyon*, No. 93-6318, 1994 WL 163765, at *1 (6th Cir. May 2, 1994) (A *pro se* litigant has a duty to supply the court with notice of any and all changes in his address). No objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation have been filed.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ADOPTED**. Consistent with the recommendation by the Magistrate Judge, this matter is **DISMISSED** without prejudice, because Plaintiff failed to prosecute it diligently and failed to comply with a Court Order.

A certificate of appealability should not issue with respect to plaintiff's claims for relief under the applicable two-part standard enunciated in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). With respect to any application by plaintiff to proceed on appeal in *forma pauperis*, the Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of any Order adopting this Report and Recommendation would not be taken in good faith, and therefore **DENIES** petitioner leave to appeal in *forma pauperis* upon a showing of financial necessity. See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a); *Kincade v. Sparkman*, 117 F.3d 949, 952 (6th Cir. 1997).

Any request for certificate of appealability or request to certify an appeal would not be taken in good faith and would be denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Michael R. Barrett
Michael R. Barrett, Judge
United States District Court